	Robert L. Starr (State Bar No. 183052)
	e-mail: starresq@hotmail.com
•	THE LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT L. STARR
}	23277 Ventura Boulevard
	Woodland Hills, California, 91364-1002
1	Telephone: (818) 225-9040
;	Facsimile: (818) 225-9042
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff Rodolfo F. Mendoza
,	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA—WESTERN DIVISION

RODOLFO FIDEL MENDOZA, individually, and on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals,

Plaintiff,

٧.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

GENERAL MOTORS, LLC,

Defendant.

EVIOer: 2683 AHM VEK

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- (1) Violations of California Consumer Legal Remedies Act
- (2) Violations of Unfair Business Practices Act – Secret Warranty
- (3) Violations of Unfair Business Practices Act
- (4) Breach of Implied Warranty pursuant to Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

 INTRODUCTION

- 1. Plaintiff Rodolfo F. Mendoza ("Plaintiff") brings this action for himself and on behalf of all similarly situated persons ("Class Members") who purchased or leased certain defective sports utility vehicles manufactured by Defendant General Motors, LLC ("GM" or "Defendant").
- 2. Defendant designed, manufactured, distributed, sold, and leased Chevrolet Equinox sport utility vehicles ("SUV") of model years 2005 to 2009 and Pontiac Torrent SUVs of model years 2006 to 2009 (collectively, the "Class Vehicles") to Plaintiff and Class Members.
- 3. Beginning in 2005, if not before, Defendant knew or should have known that the Class Vehicles contain one or more design flaws and/or structural defects that causes them to be highly prone to water leaks and flooding (the "water leak defect"), including but not limited to water leaks that result in flooding of the trunk and spare tire well, water leaks that result in damage to the vehicles' front lights and taillights, as well as water leaks to the car's interior cabin, causing mold and electrical failure due to the water damaging the computer, electrical system, and interior components of the Class Vehicles.
- 4. The water leak defect presents a safety hazard and is unreasonably dangerous to consumers for several reasons.
- 5. The water leak defect is dangerous because of the danger of catastrophic engine and/or electrical system failure as a result of the water damaging the vehicle's interior components while the vehicle is in operation. Thus, the flooding can cause engine failure, suddenly and unexpectedly, at anytime and under any driving condition or speed, thereby contributing to traffic accidents, which can result in personal injury or death.
- 6. The water leak defect is also known to cause tail lights to fail or malfunction. This creates an unreasonably dangerous situation for the driver and vehicles behind the driver that can potentially lead to rear-end accidents, or at the Case No.

 Page 1

3 4

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

very least, can result in traffic violations, tickets, and increased insurance premiums for the Class Vehicles' drivers.

- Further, the water leak defect is particularly dangerous in a relatively 7. closed environment like that found inside an SUV such as the Class Vehicles (even more so when the air is being recycled) because it can promote mold growth. For example, when it rains or when the vehicle is washed, the failure of the Class Vehicles to prevent water from entering the vehicle causes the water to accumulate in the trunk and/or passenger compartment, causing mold (as well as bacteria and other contaminants) to infect the air of the car's interior cabin, thereby exposing Class Members, their passengers, and individuals with whom they come in contact to serious health risks.
- Mold reproduces by generating spores that are released into the air, 8. which then land on moist surfaces. They thrive in dark, warm, and moist locations, such as inside trunks and under tire wells, under wet carpets, within the vehicles' interior cabins, and other such locations. Mold can trigger numerous health problems, including allergic reactions and asthma attacks. For example, exposure to these mold and other contaminants can cause difficulty breathing and headaches, as well as asthma and allergies, in those who would not otherwise have such health problems. These dangers are exacerbated by the fact that the mold and other contaminants can be transferred by touch to other surfaces separate from the vehicle. So, for example, if a passenger places an object in the trunk of a vehicle with mold, that mold can attach to the surface of that object and will be taken wherever that object is taken, e.g., the home, the workplace, school, etc. Complaints from exposure to mold include, but are not limited to, flu-like symptoms, chronic fatigue syndrome, memory impairment, migraine headaches, sick-building syndrome, dizziness, and nosebleeds.

¹ These are the mild symptoms. Many researchers claim that mold can attack several main body systems, including the brain, the central nervous Case No.

- 9. The soaked interiors of Class Vehicles subject to the water leak defect are also extremely difficult to dry properly and are often prone to hazardous mold and odor, even after several detailed cleanings. Moreover, smaller, initial leaks, as well accumulation of water under the tire well—while still causing the same damage to the vehicles and their owners (i.e., hazardous mold)—often go undetected for months or years.
- 10. In addition to safety hazards, the cost of the water leak defect to consumers can be exorbitant because consumers will be required to pay hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars both to repair the water leak defect and to repair the extensive damage that it causes to the vehicle's flooring, carpeting, and electrical systems.
- 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that
 Defendant knows or should have known that the Class Vehicles are defective and
 not fit for their intended purpose of safe and reliable transportation. Nevertheless,
 Defendant has actively concealed and failed to disclose this defect from Plaintiff
 and the Class Members at the time of purchase or lease and thereafter.
- 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that as the number of consumer complaints about the water leak defect increased, Defendant issued a secret technical service bulletin ("TSB") to its dealers in which it implemented cheaper, albeit temporary, fixes: mainly replacing and/or resealing (with a special "3M(TM) Ultrapro Autobody Sealant Clear or [its] equivalent") various structural components of the Class Vehicles that are defective, in part, because of insufficient, inadequate, or improperly applied body sealer. Although Defendant normally attributes water leaks to outside influences and does not cover

system, and the immune system. Mold has been the direct cause of some deaths. Asthmatics, infants, and individuals suffering immune system deficiencies are particularly susceptible to the deleterious effects of mold. People with asthma when exposed to strong concentrations of mold can literally die from such exposure.

28 cau

them under warranty, it has nevertheless instructed its dealers to perform the resealing and/or or replacement program at no cost to the consumer.

- 13. However, Defendant's clandestine program to temporarily fix the water leak defect, with a special sealer, was strictly limited to the most persistent customers and only those who complained loudly enough. For example, when Plaintiff's daughter complained about the water leak defect, she was told by a GM authorized dealer that "it happens here all the time" and to "just air it out."
- 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that if Defendant's secret, temporary fixes, including resealing of the various structural components of the Class Vehicles with the special sealer, are successful, the effect of these fixes only last long enough to ensure that the manifestation of the water leak defect occurs outside of warranty period, but they will not permanently remedy the problem. This ultimately leaves consumers with defective vehicles that are substantially certain to again experience the water leak defect, the consequent damage caused by water leaks, and the associated safety hazards.
- Defendant is aware that replacing and/or resealing the various structural components of the Class Vehicles does not fix the water leak defect. However, Defendant has implemented the replacing and/or resealing process simply to prolong the amount of time that will elapse before the water leak problem again manifests itself; thus, helping ensure that the water leak defect occurs outside of the warranty period so that Defendant can easily and unfairly shift financial responsibility for the water leak defect to Class Members.
- 16. Plaintiff is also informed and believes and based thereon alleges that to mollify those consumers who complain loudly enough, Defendant implemented another clandestine program to secretly reimburse or pay for repair costs of those Class Vehicles that suffer from the water leak defect and the related damage that it causes, even when the water leak defect and the related damage that it causes

 Case No.

 Page 4

occurs outside the vehicle's 3-year/36,000-mile express warranty period. However, as with its secret TSB program, Defendant's secret repair and/or reimbursement program is also strictly limited to the most persistent customers who complain loudly enough. For example, Defendant refused to replace Plaintiff's indoor carpeting damaged by the water leak defect while agreeing to replace or reimburse the floor carpeting and other similar items which is similar to the manner in which Defendant deals with the most persistent customers who complain loudly enough.

- 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that despite notice of the defect from numerous customer complaints, Defendant has not recalled the Class Vehicles to repair the defect, has not offered its customers a suitable repair or replacement free of charge, and has not offered to reimburse the Class Vehicles' owners and leaseholders the costs they incurred relating to repairing water leaks and the related damage that it causes, including but not limited to repairing or replacing electrical components and floor carpeting, detailed cleaning and drying, removal of foul odors, repairs from water damage, increased insurance premiums, vehicle rental costs, etc.
- 18. Defendant knew and concealed the defects that are contained in every Class Vehicle, along with the attendant dangerous safety problems and associated repair costs, from Plaintiff and Class Members both at the time of sale and repair and thereafter. Had Plaintiff and the Class Members known about these defects at the time of sale or lease, Plaintiff and the Class Members would not have purchased the Class Vehicles or would have paid less for them. As a result of their reliance on Defendant's omissions and/or misrepresentation, owners and/or lessees of the Class Vehicles have suffered ascertainable loss of money, property, and/or loss in value.
- 19. Additionally, as a result of the water leak defect in the Class

 Vehicles, Plaintiff and the Class Members have been harmed and have suffered

 Case No. Page 5

actual damages in that the Class Vehicles are experiencing continuous, progressive, and repeated water leak defect problems and/or are substantially certain to experience water leak defect problems before their expected useful life

has run.

PARTIES

Plaintiff:

- 20. Plaintiff Rodolfo Mendoza is a California citizen who lives in Los Angeles County, California. Mr. Mendoza purchased a used 2008 Chevrolet Equinox LS from Wondries Chevrolet on January 18, 2009. Mr. Mendoza purchased this vehicle primarily for his personal, family, or household purposes. This vehicle was manufactured, sold, distributed, advertised, marketed, and warranted by Defendant, and bears the Vehicle Identification No. 2CNDL13F786001899.
- 21. In December 2009, with approximately 35,000 miles on the vehicle's odometer and after a week with a great deal of rainfall, Mr. Mendoza's daughter, Ms. Janet Mendoza, noticed a pungent odor emanating from the vehicle that caused her light headaches and breathing difficulties. A few days later when clearing out the back seat of the vehicle, Ms. Mendoza noticed that her file folders had fallen out and were wet. Upon further investigation, Ms. Mendoza noticed that the rear passenger and driver side seat of the vehicle were all wet.
- 22. On December 15, 2009, Ms. Mendoza brought the vehicle to an authorized GM dealer, complaining that there was a foul odor and that water was leaking inside the vehicle. In response, the dealer instructed Ms. Mendoza to "just air it out" and that "it happens here all the time." Not satisfied with this response, Ms. Mendoza visited another authorized GM dealer, who ultimately sent her to O'Donnell Chevrolet-Buick, GM's authorized dealer in San Gabriel, CA. The sales manager there inspected the vehicle, opened up the trunk, and showed Ms.

Mendoza that (in addition to the interior of the vehicle) the spare tire pit in the trunk was also full of water.

- 23. O'Donnell Chevrolet did not provide Plaintiff with the fixes that Defendant had outlined in its clandestine TSB program to its dealers.
- 24. The GM dealer also confirmed that there was mold and an associated mildew odor in the vehicle but refused Plaintiff's request to replace the carpets.
- 25. When the vehicle was finally returned to Plaintiff and her daughter, the vehicle still smelled of mildew. In fact, Plaintiff's vehicle continues to experience problems associated with the water leak defect.
- 26. In addition to other damages, Plaintiff has incurred damages related to clearing the interior carpets of the vehicle. Similarly, like other class members, Plaintiff has not received the fixes outlined in Defendant's secret TSB.
- 27. At all time, Plaintiff, like all Class Members, has driven his vehicle in a foreseeable manner and in the manner in which it was intended to be used.

Defendant:

28. Defendant GM is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its headquarters and principal place of business in the State of Michigan. Defendant does business in the state of California. Defendant designs, tests, manufactures, distributes, sells, and leases Class Vehicles and sports utility Class Vehicles under several prominent brand names, including but not limited to Chevrolet, GMC, GM and Pontiac throughout the United States.

JURISDICTION

- 29. This is a class action.
- 30. Members of the proposed Plaintiff Class are citizen of California, a state different from the home state of Defendant.
- 31. On information and belief, the aggregate claims of individual Class Members exceed \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 32. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d).

 Page 7

VENUE

- 33. Defendant, through its business of distributing, selling, and leasing its Class Vehicles, has established sufficient contacts in this district such that it is subject to personal jurisdiction here. Defendant is deemed to reside in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a). Plaintiff's counsel's Declaration, as required under California Civil Code section 1780(c), which reflects that Defendant's principal place of business in California is in Los Angeles County, California, is attached as Exhibit 1.
- 34. In addition, a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims and a substantial part of the property that is the subject of this action are in this district.
 - 35. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a).

APPLICABLE LAW

36. California State law applies to all claims in this action.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 37. For years, Defendant has designed, manufactured, distributed, sold, and leased the Class Vehicles. Upon information and belief, it has sold, directly or indirectly through dealers and other retail outlets, thousands, if not tens of thousands, of Class Vehicles in California and nationwide.
- 38. The Class Vehicles contain a water leak defect. This defect is substantially and unreasonably dangerous, as it can result in drivers of the Class Vehicles being exposed to hazardous contaminants, such as mold. Further, the water leak defect can lead to irreparable damage to electrical and mechanical components in the Class Vehicles, such as the front lights and tail lights, which creates a serious operational and safety concern to both the Class Vehicles' occupants and the public.
- 39. The water leak defect is also dangerous because of the danger of catastrophic engine and/or electrical system failure as a result of leaked water Case No.

 Page 8

damaging the vehicle's interior components while the vehicle is in operation. Thus, the flooding can cause engine failure, suddenly and unexpectedly, at any time and under any driving condition or at any speed, thereby contributing to traffic accidents, which can result in personal injury or death.

- 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant acquired its knowledge of the water leak defect through sources not available to Class Members, including but not limited to pre-release testing data, early consumer complaints about the water leak defect to Defendant and its dealers who are its agents for vehicle repairs, testing conducted in response to those complaints, aggregate data from Defendant's dealers, and from other internal sources.
- 41. Hundreds, if not thousands, of purchasers and lessees of the Class Vehicles have experienced problems with water leaks. Complaints filed by consumers with the NHTSA and posted on the Internet demonstrate that the defect is widespread and dangerous, and that it manifests without warning. The complaints also indicate Defendant's awareness of the defect and how potentially dangerous the defective condition is (note that spelling and grammar mistakes remain as found in the original):
 - NHTSA Complaint: ON JAN. 11, 2010, I STARTED MY CAR TO LET IT WARM UP BEFORE LEAVING FOR WORK. I LET THE CAR RUN FOR ABOUT 10 MINUTES. DROVE THE 20 MINUTE DRIVE TO WORK, AND WHEN I GOT DOWNTOWN, THE CAR SHUT DOWN AND ALL OF THE WARNING LIGHTS ON THE DASHBOARD CAME ON. WAS ABLE TO COAST TO SIDE OF STREET AND STOP CAR. RESTARTED CAR AND PUT INTO DRIVE. ALL WARNING LIGHTS STILL ON, AND DON'T HAVE ANY POWER. WAS ABLE TO COAX CAR TO GO THREE BLOCKS TO PARKING LOT, AND CALLED DEALER WHO

Case No.

CAME AND GOT THE CAR. AFTER CHECKING, I WAS TOLD THAT WATER HAD LEAKED DOWN THE RIGHT FRONT PASSENGER SIDE OF THE WINDOW, FREEZING, THAWING AND BACKING UP WHICH GOT TO THE WIRING AND BURNT IT OUT. REALLY GLAD THAT I WASN'T ON THE INTERSTATE THAT MORNING. *TR

23

24

25

26

27

28

NHTSA Complaint: EQUINOX HAS HAD POWER FAILURE WHILE DRIVING 6+ TIMES...ALL WHEN DRIVING IN WET CONDITIONS (EITHER RAINING OR HAVING JUST RAINED). FIRST TIME WAS TOLD BY DEALERSHIP THAT I DROVE THRU A PUDDLE AND GOT EVERYTHING WET (I DIDN'T); HAD SOMETHING TO DO WITH THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM REPLACED. HAVE TAKEN CAR BACK TO DEALER WITHIN THE LAST TWO MONTHS BECAUSE IT HAPPENED AGAIN. AND WAS TOLD ALL OF MY WEATHERSTRIPPING NEEDED REPLACING B/C THAT WAS ALLOWING WATER IN. HAD THIS DONE. HAPPENED AGAIN TONIGHT (WET WEATHER TODAY, BUT WAS NOT RAINING WHEN I WAS DRIVING). THE OTHER TIMES THIS HAS OCCURRED, I'VE LET MY EQUINOX SIT WHERE IT DIED FOR A FEW DAYS TO LET IT "DRY OUT" AND THAT HAS WORKED, BUT THIS NOT EXACTLY THE BEST SOLUTION AS I DON'T LIVE IN THE DESERT AND IT DOES RAIN HERE. CHEVY DEALER OF NO HELP; SAID HE AGREES THERE IS A MANUFACTURING DEFECT BUT THERE IS NOTHING HE CAN DO ABOUT IT. ADVISED ME TO CALL CHEVY CS. I HAVE DEALT WITH THEM BEFORE ON ANOTHER EQUINOX ISSUE AND THEY

Case No.

LOSS OF POWER IS DANGEROUS!! *TR

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28 Case No.

Page 11

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

FOR A QUICK CAR WASH OR IF IT RAINS REALLY HARD (IN FLORIDA IT DOES)... WATER LEAKS THROUGH THE LIGHTS IN THE CEILING, THE BACK HATCH, AND THROUGH THE FLOOR BOARDS. MY CHECK ENGINE LIGHT COMES ON AND THE DEALER TELLS ME THAT IT IS WATER CORROSION FROM THE WATER LEAKING THROUGH THE ELECTRICAL WIRING HARNESS. THIS CAUSES MY CAR TO RUN, EVEN THOUGH I HAVE MY PEDAL TO THE FLOOR, VERY SLOW, I CAN'T GO PAST 10MPH, I AM AFRAID OF ELECTRICAL FIRE. I CAN HARDLY TURN A CORNER... I AM AFRAID OF A CAR ACCIDENT. MY CAR IS ONLY 2 YEARS OLD NOW... 4/2008 AND THIS HAS HAPPENED A 3RD TIME. MY BATTERY HAS ALREADY HAD TO BE REPLACED AND MY RADIO REPLACED TWICE BECAUSE OF THE "CD CHANGER ERROR". NOW I CAN ONLY IMAGINE, WITH ALL OF THE WATER THAT KEEPS COMING IN, WHAT CONDITION MY CAR WILL BE IN A FEW MONTHS FROM NOW. ELECTRICAL PROBLEMS, BAD SMELL, CORRODING FLOOR BOARDS AND WHO KNOWS WHAT ELSE. *TR

WERE OF NO HELP. WISH I WOULD HAVE INVESTIGATED

MY STATE'S LEMON LAW IN TIME. SUDDEN AND TOTAL

NHTSA Complaint: EVERYTIME THAT I TAKE MY CAR IN

TO BE SERVICED AND THEY HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO DIAGNOSIS THE FAILURE. *AK

- NHTSA Complaint: 2007 PONTIAC TORRENT (CHEVROLET EQUINOX) SHUTTERS AND ABS BRAKES MALFUNCTION DURING HEAVY RAIN STORMS. SHUTTERING FEELING IS VERY PRONOUNCED, ENTIRE DRIVE TRAIN SHAKES. THIS COMPLAINT IS SIMILAR OR IDENTICAL TO OPI # 10230804 AND 10211398. IT HAS OCCURRED SINCE THE CAR WAS NEW, ABOUT 20 TIMES, CAR NOW HAS 51,000 MILES. MULTIPLE DEALER RETURNS COULD NOT DUPLICATE.
 - NHTSA Complaint: THE BACK FLOORBOARD OF MY CAR
 HAS BEEN NOTICABLY WET FOR A FEW MONTHS. MY CAR
 IS OUT OF WARRANTY SO I BEGAN RESEARCHING ONLINE
 TO SEE WHAT MIGHT BE THE PROBLEM. THE SEALS
 AROUND THE DOORS WERE FINE. 1 DID FIND 3" OF WATER
 LAYING IN MY SPARE TIRE COMPARTMENT. THERE IS NO
 DRAIN HOLE FOR THE WATER TO BE REMOVED. THE
 WATER IS COMING IN FROM THE TAIL LIGHTS. THE
 DEALERSHIP I PURCHASED THE EQUINOX FROM SIMPLY
 LAUGHED AT THE PROBLEM AND SAID IT WOULD COST
 OVER \$200 TO REPLACE JUST THE TAIL LIGHT. THE SMELL
 INSIDE OF THE VEHICLE IS HORRIBLE. IT IS OBVIOUSLY
 RUSTING THE BODY AND CAUSING MOLD AND MILDEW
 INSIDE THE VEHICLE. *TR
- NHTSA Complaint: I AM EXPERIENCING AN EXTREMELY STRONG MILDEW SMELL INSIDE MY EQUINOX. IT IS SO STRONG PEOPLE COMMENT OUTSIDE THE CAR. THE SMELL ALSO PENETRATES CLOTHING SO THAT OTHERS

Case No.

- 1	1	
1		NOTICE THE SMELL. P
2		HAVE HAD IT TO THE I
3		ODOR IMPROVES SLIGI
4		BUT STILL OTHERS CO
5		DRIVING MY 3 YEAR O
6		FOUND NO VISIBLE WE
7		AROUND TWO WINDOW
8		DID NOT FIND WATER
9		DOES NOT SEEM TO BE
10		MORES SO JUST FROM
11	•	NHTSA Complaint: W.
12		TWICE CAUSING MOLD
13	•	NHTSA Complaint: TH
14		THROUGH A CAR WASE
15		WITH WATER, THE LOW
16		*SC *JB
17	•	NHTSA Complaint: SPARI
18		THE REAR OF MY EQUI
19		MORNING IT HAD MOR
20		REALIZE THIS WAS HAI
21		WHERE IT IS COMING F
22		SAME PROBLEM AS DO
23		FLEET VEHICLES). HE J
24		LOOKED IN MINE. HE H
25		AS HE WAS GETTING SI
26	•	NHTSA Complaint: I HAD
27		COMPARTMENT REPLA
28	1	THE FRAME OF THE BO

NOTICE THE SMELL. PEOPLE WILL NOT RIDE IN MY CAR. I HAVE HAD IT TO THE DEALER TWICE. BOTH TIMES THE ODOR IMPROVES SLIGHTLY (THEY DEPDORIZE THE HVAC) BUT STILL OTHERS COMMENT. I AM CONCERNED ABOUT DRIVING MY 3 YEAR OLD B/C OF THE SMELL. WE HAVE FOUND NO VISIBLE WETNESS OR MOLD. THE RUBBER AROUND TWO WINDOWS WAS LOOSE BUT THE DEALER DID NOT FIND WATER INSIDE THE DOOR. THE SMELL DOES NOT SEEM TO BE COMING FROM THE VENTS BUT MORES SO JUST FROM THE CAR. *NM

- NHTSA Complaint: ... WATER SOAKING FLOOR BOARDS
 TWICE CAUSING MOLD & MILDEW *NM
- NHTSA Complaint: . . . THE CONSUMER HAD DRIVEN

 THROUGH A CAR WASH, THE DOME LIGHT HAD FILLED

 WITH WATER, THE LOWER DASH WAS DRIPPING WATER . .

 . . *SC *JB
- NHTSA Complaint: SPARE TIRE WELL UNDER THE FLOOR IN THE REAR OF MY EQUINOX FILLS WITH WATER. THIS MORNING IT HAD MORE THAN TWO INCHES. I DID NOT REALIZE THIS WAS HAPPENING AND I DO NOT KNOW WHERE IT IS COMING FROM. MY NEIGHBOR HAS THE SAME PROBLEM AS DOES HIS COWORKER (BOTH ARE FLEET VEHICLES). HE JUST TOLD ME ABOUT IT AND I LOOKED IN MINE. HE HAS GOTTEN A NEW COMPANY CAR AS HE WAS GETTING SICK FROM MOLD FROM THE LEAK.
- NHTSA Complaint: I HAD TO HAVE MY TRUNK

 COMPARTMENT REPLACED AND SOME AREAS AROUND

 THE FRAME OF THE BODY RE-SEALED DUE TO EXCESS

Case No.

WATER ACCUMULATING IN THE SPARE TIME AREA. I WAS FIRST TOLD BY THE DEALER REPAIR SHOP THAT IT WAS A DEFECT BUT WHEN I REQUESTED REIMBURSEMENT GM DENIED THAT THE DEALER EVER TOLD THEM THIS. I BELIEVE GM IS DENYING THAT THERE ARE SOME STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS WITH THIS YEAR AND MODEL AND MY FEAR IS THAT ANOTHER YEAR DOWN THE ROAD THERE WILL BE OTHER ISSUES WITH THE FRAME/BODY OF THIS MODEL VEHICLE. ALSO, IT BOTHERS ME THAT WE ARE ENCOURAGED TO "BUY AMERICAN" BUT THE AMERICAN CAR MAKERS DO NOT WANT TO STAND UP TO THEIR PROMISE OF GOOD MAKEMANSHIP. I AM DISAPPOINTED AND ESPECIALLY WITH THE DISHONESTY AT THE CORPORATE LEVEL OF THIS CORPORATION. *TR NHTSA Complaint: WE OWN A 2007 EQUINOX, OUR FRIEND STATED THAT HIS EQUINOX HAD WATER IN THE SPARE TIRE COMPARTMENT. WE HAVE BEEN GETTING SICK FOR A WHILE AND DIDN'T KNOW WHY. WE LOOKED IN OUR SPARE TIRE COMPARTMENT AND THERE WAS A FOOT OF WATER. NOW WE CANNOT DRIVE THIS VEHICLE FOR HEALTH REASONS. GM KNEW ABOUT THIS PROBLEM FOR

THERE ARE 3 SERVICE BULLETINS FOR THIS PROBLEM.
THEY WILL NOT HELP US WITH A TRADE ASSIST AND WE
CANNOT DRIVE IT DUE TO THE MOLD. WE HAVE
CONDENSATION IN THE INSIDE OF THE VEHICLE AND
HAVE TO WIPE IT OFF WITH A TOWEL BEFORE WE CAN
DRIVE IT. THE VEHICLE IS FULL OF MOLD! I'M SURE THIS
VEHICLE HAS BEEN LEAKING SINCE DAY ONE! *TR

Page 14

- 1 2 3 4
- Internet Posting: 2007 Pontiac Torrent, water in the spare tire well, been to dealer 4 times, still leaks, 1st & 2nd time replaced a tail light, 3rd time sealed seam in rear panel, 4th time sealed wire grommets at the top of rear door & removed both taillights to seal some body seams. Will not leak with a water hose, only when it rains.
- 6 7

• <u>Internet Posting</u>: my 07 equinox is also getting water in the tire well but they dont know where the leak is coming from

8

9

Internet Posting: My 2006 Equinox leaks from the driver side near the Hood release I have to keep towels down when it rains. any suggestions??????? In washington state where it rains all the time is

10 11

not good-.

Internet Posting: good luck, I have a 07 Equinox and after taking it to

13

14

12

the dealership and them sending it out for repair and fixing 9-10 leaks..... I still have water under the spare tire... Also major concern

15

for mold buildup in my carpet. . . . I'm soooooooo tired of having

16

to deal with this. . . . that was one of the 9 or 10 leaks they have fixed

17

so far. thanks for sharing here's an update ... I now have a lemon law atty. we are waiting for better business bureau to inspect

18 19

my vehicle. I have purchased a mold kit and will put it in the car

20

tomarrow. I have been back and forth to the doctor soooo many

2122

times lately. They now think I have asthma due to being around mold ... hmm wonder where I could have been around mold my

23

doctor advised me not to drive my car anymore .. GM does not want

24

to do anything about this, I am so sick of this, Now my car is parked

25

under a car cover. Gatta love paying for a car note and insurance on

26

something I cannot drive, I have made it my goal to make sure every equinox I see driving around knows to check for this issue .. ,

2728

hopefully I can catch them before their warranty wears out.

- Internet Posting: I CANT STOP CRYTNG!! i have about ten gallons of standing water in my tire well and the dealer ship just sent me to a "water work place" it will cost me 1,000 dollars ..insurance will not cover it will take 4days to fix it. It will cost 180.00 to rent a car. I have no radio the water damage blew my amp located under back seats so i have to that fixed!! no one can just empty out the water till i come up with this lump sum of money
- Internet Posting: the dealership that we bought the car from is saying that our warranty doesnt cover the leak. I told the service dude to look online to see how many other equinoxes have this SAME problem, but he didnt care, He said that since there isnt a Government recall, they cant do anything. He thought that \$1000,00 was a good price to pay to seal the rubber part up. Are you freaking kidding me ..., um no thanks, So if any of you got your warranty to cover this ... I just want to know how.
- 42. Customers have reported the water leak defect in the Class Vehicles to Defendant directly and through its dealers. Defendant is fully aware of the water leak defect in the Class Vehicles. Despite this, Defendant has actively concealed the existence and nature of the defect from Plaintiff and the Class Members at the time of purchase or lease and thereafter. Specifically, Defendant has:
 - a. failed to disclose, at and after the time of purchase or lease and repair, any and all known material defects or material nonconformity of the Class Vehicles, including the water leak defect of the Class Vehicles and its associated repair costs;
 - b. failed to disclose at the time of purchase or lease that the Class Vehicles, including the water leak defect of the Class Vehicles,

Case No.

fit for their intended purpose; and failed to disclose or actively concealed the fact that the Class

were not in good working order, were defective, and were not

- c. failed to disclose or actively concealed the fact that the Class

 Vehicles had a water leak defect, despite the fact that

 Defendant learned of such defects through consumer

 complaints, as well as other internal sources, as early as 2005,

 if not before.
- 43. Defendant has caused Plaintiff and Class Members to expend money at its dealerships or other third-party facilities to clean, repair, replace parts and/or take other remedial measures related to the water leak defect of the Class Vehicles, as well as to repair or replace items damaged by water leaks and flooding resulting from the water leak defect, despite Defendant's knowledge of the water leak defect.
- 44. Further, Defendant has caused Plaintiff and Class Members to expend money professionally cleaning the Class Vehicles, as well as to find alternative means of transportation due to loss of use of the Class Vehicles.
- 45. Defendant has not recalled the Class Vehicles to repair the defect, has not offered to its customers a suitable repair or replacement of parts free of charge related to the water leak defect, has not offered to reimburse Class Vehicle owners and leaseholders who incurred costs relating to repairs related to the water leak defect, and has not offered to reimburse Class Members any other costs associated with repairing or addressing problems caused by the water leak defect.
- 46. The Class Members have not received the value for which they bargained for when they purchased or leased the Class Vehicles.
- 47. As a result of the defect, the value of the Class Vehicles has diminished, including without limitation their resale values.

Defendant has violated, and continues to violate, California Civil

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

48.

consumers who complain loudly enough; the quiet consumer either does not fix the problem or pays to fix the defect by himself or herself. 49. Defendant is a "manufacturer" as that term is defined by section 1795.50 of the California Secret Warranty Law. Section 1795.2 of the California Secret Warranty Law imposes several duties on auto manufacturers like Defendant, each of which is designed to do away with secret warranties.

document is not necessary to create a secret warranty. Because owners are kept

in the dark about the cost-free repair, the automaker only has to reimburse those

Plaintiff and members of the proposed Class are consumers as that **50**. term is defined by section 1795.90(a) of the California Secret Warranty Law. The California Secret Warranty law requires automakers to notify consumers, by firstclass mail, within 90 days of adoption, whenever they enact "any program or policy that expands or extends the consumer's warranty beyond its stated limit or under which [the] manufacturer offers to pay for all or any part of the cost of repairing, or to reimburse consumers for all or any part of the cost of repairing, Page 18 Case No.

any condition that may substantially effect vehicle durability, reliability, or performance"

- 51. The California Secret Warranty Law also requires automakers to provide the New Motor Vehicle Board with a copy of the notice described above, so the public can view, inspect, or copy that notice.
- 52. Additionally, the California Secret Warranty Law requires automakers to advise their dealers, in writing, of the terms and conditions of any warranty extension, adjustment, or reimbursement program.
- 53. The California Secret Warranty Law also requires an automaker to "implement procedures to assure reimbursement of each consumer eligible under an adjustment program who incurs expenses for repair of a condition subject to the program prior to acquiring knowledge of the program."
- 54. In 2008, Defendant issued a TSB. The TSB describes the numerous water leak defects suffered by the Class Vehicles:
 - a. Water may be entering from top of the strut tower into the driver side and or passenger side floor.
 - b. Water may be entering through the seams in the floor pan on the driver side and/or passenger side.
 - c. Water may be entering through the liftgate weatherstrip.
 - d. Water may be entering between the liftgate and the weatherstrip.
 - e. Water may be entering through a gap in the sealer at the rear D-pillar (roof to body).
 - f. Water in spare tire.
 - g. Water in the rear compartment.

The TSB also describes the numerous possible causes of those water leak defects:

a. Water may be entering from top of the strut tower into the driver side and or passenger side floor.

Case No.

1	b .	Water may be entering through the seams in the floor pan on
2		the driver side and/or passenger side.
3	c.	Water may be entering through the liftgate weatherstrip.
4	d.	Water may be entering between the liftgate and the
5		weatherstrip.
6	e.	Water may be entering through a gap in the sealer at the rear
7		D-pillar (roof to body).
8	f.	Water may be entering through a gap in the sealer behind the
9		rear fascia.
10	g.	Water may be entering through a gap in the sheet metal behind
11		the tail lamps.
12	Finally, the TSB of	lescribes the various temporary fixes for the water leak defects:
13	a.	Reseal the strut tower. Use 3M(TM) Ultrapro Autobody
14		Sealant Clear or equivalent.
15	b.	Remove the carpet and reseal the sheet metal seam.
16	c.	Remove the weatherstrip and reseal the sheet metal.
17	d.	Adjust the liftgate. Refer to Liftgate Adjustment in SI.
18	e .	Remove the roof rack and inspect for any voids in the sealant.
19		Refer to Luggage Carrier Replacement Equinox or Torrent in
20		SI. Use 3M TM Ultrapro Autobody Sealant Clear or equivalent.
21	f.	Remove the rear fascia and reseal the sheet metal seam. Refer
22		to Rear Bumper Fascia Replacement in SI.
23	g.	Remove the tail lamps. Refer to Tail Lamp Replacement in SI
24		and reseal the sheet metal seam.
25	55. The 1	SB further states: "Important: IF A MILDEW ODOR IS
26	PRESENT IN TH	E VEHICLE, REFER TO PIT4535." (emphasis in original).
27		
28		

- 56. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the free water leak defect repairs outlined in Defendant's secret TSB is applicable to all Class Vehicles.
- 57. Defendant does not typically pay for repairing the water leak defect under its new car warranty (or any other warranty) because Defendant considers water leaks to be the result of outside influences and, therefore, not covered by Defendant's express warranty. In fact, Defendant or Defendant's authorized dealers for vehicle repairs typically tell consumers that the water leak defect is as a result of an outside influence and not covered under warranty. Thus, by extending its warranties to cover repair of the water leak defect, Defendant has "expand[ed] or extend[ed] the consumer's warranty beyond its stated limit."
- 58. Additionally, the vehicle performance problems that the TSB resealing and/or replacement procedures are intended to address "substantially affect the vehicle durability, reliability, or performance." These problems include, but are not limited to, engine failure, electrical system failure, as well as water damage to interior components of the vehicles and tail lights, and rust. Therefore, the offers to provide free repair of the water leak defect are "adjustment programs" within the meaning of the California Secret Warranty Law.
- 59. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that

 Defendant has also extended its warranty in another way; namely, by employing a
 secret policy to pay for the water leak defect related damage of those consumers

² For example, a GM consumer explained GM's refusal to provide warranty coverage this way:

The dealership that we bought the car from is saying that our warranty doesnt cover the leak. I told the service dude to look online to see how many other equinoxes have this SAME problem, but he didnt care, He said that since there isnt a Government recall, they cant do anything. He thought that \$1000,00 was a good price to pay to seal the rubber part up. Are you freaking kidding me ..., um no thanks, So if any of you got your warranty to cover this ... I just want to know how.

 who complain loudly enough. The decision to offer this free repair outside the vehicle's New Car Warranty is not done on an ad hoc basis. Rather, it is made pursuant to a systematic policy—communicated to inter alia, regional offices, dealers, and GM customer care personnel—to pacify the most vocal consumers so as to preserve Defendant's reputation. Upon information and belief, the code names for these policies, include but are not limited to good will adjustments or policy adjustments.³

- 60. Again, water leaks are not normally included in the warranty coverage. Thus, by extending its warranties to cover the water leak defect and/or related damage, Defendant has "expand[ed] or extend[ed] the consumer's warranty beyond its stated limit." Thus, Defendant's temporary repair and/or repair of damage constitutes an adjustment program under the Secret Warranty Law and constitutes an offer to pay for or to reimburse consumers for the cost of repairing a condition that substantially affects vehicle durability, reliability, or performance.
- 61. As a result of the foregoing, Defendant is obligated to comply with the provisions of the California Secret Warranty Law with respect to its resealing, replacing, repairing, and reimbursement offers. It has not done so.
- 62. Specifically, Defendant did not notify Plaintiff, or any other owner or lessee of a Class Vehicle, of their right to free repair of the water leak defect and consequent damage, or to be reimbursed for the cost of repairing the water leak defect and consequent damage (e.g., replacement of interior carpets, as well as other components within the vehicle damaged by the water leak defect).
- 63. Defendant has also refused to provide the free water leak repair, replacement or reimbursement to owners or lessees of affected vehicles who have

³ For example, Defendant refused to replace Plaintiff's indoor carpets, while at the same time it has reimbursed or replaced such items for other consumers who complain loudly enough for the same and/or similar items.

28 |

specifically requested it. Moreover, even though Defendant is aware of fixes for this problem, Defendant has refused to notify Plaintiff, or any other owner or lessee of a Class Vehicle, of these available fixes and has refused to reimburse owners or lessees of Class Vehicles for the consequent damages that the water leak defect causes.

- 64. Additionally, Defendant has refused to reimburse consumers who have paid to repair the water leak defect and/or paid for damage resulting from the water leak defect.
- 65. Upon information and belief, Defendant did not comply with the dealer-notification provisions of the California Secret Warranty Law.
- 66. Upon information and belief, Defendant has also failed to comply with the New Motor Vehicle Board notification procedures.

TOLLING OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

- 67. Since the defects in the design or manufacture of the Class Vehicles resulting in water leaks cannot be detected until the defect manifests, Plaintiff and Class Members were not reasonably able to discover the problem until long after purchasing or leasing the Class Vehicles, despite their exercise of due diligence.
- 68. Plaintiff and Class Members had no realistic ability to discern the water leak defect until water leaks occurred, and in some instances, until long after the water leaks occurred, and/or until a moldy smell resulted from the water leaks. In addition, despite their due diligence, Plaintiff and Class Members could not reasonably have been expected to learn or discover that they were deceived and that material information concerning the water leak defect was concealed from them, until manifestation of the defect. Therefore, the discovery rule is applicable to the claims asserted by Plaintiff and the Class Members.
- 69. Upon information and belief, Defendant has known of the structural defects contained in the Class Vehicles since at least 2005, if not earlier, and has

concealed from or failed to alert owners and lessees of the Class Vehicles of the water leak defect.

70. Any applicable statutes of limitation have therefore been tolled by Defendant's concealment and denial of the facts alleged here. Defendant is further estopped from relying on any statutes of limitation because of its concealment of the defective nature of the Class Vehicles.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 71. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit as a class action on behalf of himself and all other California residents similarly situated as members of a proposed Plaintiff Class pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3) and/or (b)(2). This action satisfies the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, predominance, and superiority requirements of those provisions.
 - 72. The Class and Sub-Class is defined as:

<u>Class</u>: All persons in the State of California who purchased or leased a Chevrolet Equinox for the model years 2005-2009 or a Pontiac Torrent of any type for the model years 2006-2009.

<u>Sub-Class</u>: All Members of the Class who are "consumers" within the meaning of California Civil Code section 1761(d) ("the CLR Sub-Class").

Excluded from the Class are Defendant, any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest or which has a controlling interest of Defendant, and Defendant's legal representatives, assigns, and successors. Also excluded is the judge to whom this case is assigned, as well as any member of the judge's immediate family.

- 73. Claims for personal injury are specifically excluded from the Class.
- 74. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the Class and Sub-Class definitions if discovery and further investigation reveal that the Class and Sub-Class should be expanded or otherwise limited.

- 75. <u>Numerosity</u>: Although the exact number of Class Members is uncertain and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, the number is great enough such that joinder is impracticable. The disposition of the claims of these Class Members in a single class action will provide substantial benefits to all parties and to the Court.
- 76. Typicality: The claims of the representative Plaintiff is typical of the claims of the Class in that the representative Plaintiff, like all Class Members, owns a Class Vehicle designed and manufactured by Defendant that has the water leak defect. The representative Plaintiff, like all Class Members, has been damaged by Defendant's misconduct in that he has incurred or will incur the cost of repairing the water leak defect or repairing damage caused by the defective water leak defect. Furthermore, the factual basis of Defendant's misconduct are common to all Class Members and represent a common thread of fraudulent, deliberate, and negligent misconduct resulting in injury to all Members of the Class.
- 77. Commonality: There are numerous questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and the Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common legal and factual issues include the following.
 - a. Whether the Class Vehicles are defectively designed or manufactured such that they are not suitable for their intended use;
 - b. Whether Defendant knew or should have known of the inherent design or manufacturing defect in its Class Vehicles;
 - c. Whether Defendant fraudulently concealed from or failed to disclose to Plaintiff and the Class the inherent problems with its Class Vehicles:

Case No.

- m. Whether Defendant should be declared financially responsible for notifying all Class Members of the problems with its Class Vehicles and for the costs and expenses of repair and replacement of the Class Vehicles;
- n. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to replacement of parts related to the water leak defect;
- 78. Adequate Representation: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff has retained counsel with substantial experience in prosecuting consumer class actions—specifically actions involving defective products. Plaintiff and his counsel are committed to prosecuting this action vigorously on behalf of the Class and have the financial resources to do so. Neither Plaintiff nor his counsel has any interest adverse to those of the Class.
- Class have all suffered and will continue to suffer harm and damages as a result of Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. Absent a class action, most Class Members would likely find the cost of litigating their claims prohibitively high and would therefore have no effective remedy at law. Because of the relatively small size of the individual Class Member's claims, it is likely that only a few Class Members could afford to seek legal redress for Defendant's misconduct. Absent a class action, Class Members will continue to incur damages and Defendant's misconduct will continue without remedy. Class treatment of common questions of law and fact would also be superior to multiple individual actions or piecemeal litigation in that class treatment will conserve the resources of the courts and the litigants, and will promote consistency and efficiency of adjudication.

6

8

11

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Violation of California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act, California Civil Code section 1750 et seq.)

- 80. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 81. Plaintiff brings this cause of action against Defendant on behalf of himself and on behalf of the Members of the CLRA Sub-Class.
 - 82. Defendant is a "person" as defined by Civil Code section 1761(c).
- 83. Plaintiff and Class Members are consumers who purchased or leased the Class Vehicles.
- 84. By failing to disclose and concealing the water leak defect, Defendant violated Civil Code section 1770(a), as it represented that its Class Vehicles had characteristics and benefits that they do not have, and represented that its Class Vehicles were of a particular standard, quality or grade when they were of another. (See Civ. Code §§ 1770(a)(5) & (7).)
- 85. Defendant's unfair or deceptive acts or practices occurred repeatedly in Defendant's trade or business, were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the purchasing public, and imposed a serious safety risk on the public.
- 86. Defendant knew that its Class Vehicles were defectively designed or manufactured, would fail prematurely, and were not suitable for their intended use.
- 87. Defendant was under a duty to Plaintiff and the Class to disclose the defective nature of the Class Vehicles:
 - Defendant was in a superior position to know the true state of facts about the safety defect and associated repair costs in the Class Vehicles;

- b. Plaintiff and the Class Members could not reasonably have been expected to learn or discover that the Class Vehicles had a dangerous safety defect until manifestation of the failure; and
- c. Defendant knew that Plaintiff and the Class Members could not reasonably have been expected to learn or discover the safety defect and the associated repair costs that it causes.
- 88. In failing to disclose the water leak defect and the associated repair costs that it causes, Defendant has knowingly and intentionally concealed material facts and breached its duty not to do so.
- 89. The facts concealed or not disclosed by Defendant to Plaintiff and the Class are material in that a reasonable consumer would have considered them to be important in deciding whether to purchase Defendant's Class Vehicles or pay a lesser price. Had Plaintiff and the Class known the defective nature of the Class Vehicles, they would not have purchased the Class Vehicles or would have paid less for them.
- 90. Plaintiff and the Class reasonably expected the Class Vehicles to function properly and not to experience water leaks inside the interior cabin for the life of their vehicles. That is the reasonable and objective consumer expectation.
- 91. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unfair or deceptive acts or practices, Plaintiff and the Class have suffered and will continue to suffer actual damages.
- 92. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to equitable and injunctive relief.
- 93. Plaintiff has provided Defendant with notice of its alleged violations of the CLRA pursuant to Civil Code section 1782(a). If, within 30 days of the date of the notification letter, Defendant fails to provide appropriate relief for its

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

4 5

(Violation of California's Unfair Business Practices Act, California Business & Professions Code section 17200 et seq. – Violations of California's Secret Warranty Law)

7

8

6

94. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

9

95. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of himself and on behalf of the Members of the Class.

11

12

13

96. By committing the acts and practices alleged herein, Defendant violated the Secret Warranty Law, and by doing so, has engaged in deceptive, unfair, and unlawful business practices in violation of the Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"), California Business & Professions Code section 17200 et seq.

14

15

16

97. Defendant's violation of the Secret Warranty Law (hence the UCL) continues to this day. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violations of the Secret Warranty Law, hence the UCL, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages related to the water leak defect.

17 18

19

20

21

22

98. Pursuant to section 17203 of the UCL, Plaintiff and Class Members seek an order of this Court requiring Defendant to comply with the terms of the California Secret Warranty Law by: (a) notifying Class Members of the secret program for repairing the water leak defect and reimbursing for damage caused by the water leak defect as required by the California Secret Warranty Law; (b)

2324

providing free repairs, modifications, corrections, and/or replacements to all Class

25

Members as required by the Secret Warranty Law; (c) identifying and reimbursing all Class Members who have made payments related to the water leak defect as

27

26

required by the Secret Warranty Law; (d) notifying California dealers of the facts underlying the water leak defect and the terms of the secret program for repairing

28

Case No.

the water leak defect and reimbursing for damage caused by the water leak defect as required by the Secret Warranty Law; and (e) notifying the California New Motor Vehicle Board of the secret program for repairing the water leak defect and reimbursing for damage caused by the water leak defect as required by the Secret Warranty Law.

99. Plaintiff and Class Members also seek an order: (a) enjoining Defendant from failing and refusing to make full restitution of all moneys wrongfully obtained as a result of its violations of the California Secret Warranty Law, and (b) disgorging to Plaintiff and Class Members all ill-gotten revenues and/or profits earned as a result of Defendant's violation of the California Secret Warranty Law, plus an award of attorneys' fees and costs. This is because Defendant profited from its sale of replacement parts to mechanics and dealers because they ultimately replaced, repaired, corrected, or modified the defective and/or replacement parts related to the water leak defect and damage caused by the water leak defect.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Violation of UCL other than Violation of the Secret Warranty Law,
California's Unfair Business Practices Act, California Business & Professions
Code section 17200 et seq.)

- 100. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 101. Plaintiff brings this cause of action against Defendant on behalf of himself and on behalf of the Members of the Class.
- 102. California Business & Professions Code section 17200 prohibits acts of "unfair competition," including any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice" and "unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising."

- 103. Defendant knew its Class Vehicles were defectively designed or manufactured, would fail prematurely, and were not suitable for their intended use.
- 104. Defendant concealed and failed to disclose to Plaintiff and the Class the defective nature of the Class Vehicles:
 - a. Defendant was in a superior position to know the true state of facts about the safety defects contained in the Class Vehicles;
 - Defendant made partial disclosures about the quality of the
 Class Vehicles without revealing that they were defective and
 highly prone to water leakage and flooding; and
 - c. Defendant actively concealed the defective nature of the Class Vehicles from Plaintiff and the Class.
- 105. In failing to disclose the water leak defect, Defendant has knowingly and intentionally concealed material facts and breached its duty not to do so.
- 106. The facts concealed or not disclosed by Defendant to Plaintiff and the Class are material in that a reasonable person would have considered them to be important in deciding whether to purchase the Class Vehicles or pay a lesser price for them. Had Plaintiff and the Class known about the defective nature of the Class Vehicles, they would not have purchased the Class Vehicles or would have paid less for them.
- 107. Defendant continues to conceal the defective nature of the Class Vehicles even after Class Members began to report problems. Indeed, Defendant continues to cover up and conceal the true nature of the problem until this date.
- 108. By its conduct alleged herein, Defendant has engaged in unfair competition and unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business acts and practices.
- 109. Defendant's unfair or deceptive acts or practices occurred repeatedly in Defendant's trade or business, and were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the purchasing public.

- 110. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unfair and deceptive practices, Plaintiff and the Class have suffered and will continue to suffer actual damages.
- 111. Defendant has been unjustly enriched and should be required to make restitution to Plaintiff and the Class pursuant to sections 17203 and 17204 of the California Business & Professions Code.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Implied Warranty pursuant to Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, California Civil Code sections 1792 and 1791.1 et. seq.)

- 112. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 113. Plaintiff brings this cause of action against Defendant on behalf of himself and on behalf of the Members of the Class.
- 114. Defendant was at all relevant times the manufacturer, distributor, warrantor, and/or seller of the Class Vehicles. Defendant knew or had reason to know of the specific use for which the Class Vehicles were purchased.
- 115. Defendant provided Plaintiff and Class Members with an implied warranty that the Class Vehicles are merchantable and fit for the ordinary purposes for which they were sold. However, the Class Vehicles are not fit for their ordinary purpose of providing reasonably reliable and safe transportation because, *inter alia*, the Class Vehicles are defective due to the water leak defect and the resulting safety-related and health hazards that it can cause.
- 116. Plaintiff and other Class Members never contemplated that their vehicles would be unable to withstand water (e.g., from rain or a carwash), eventually become flooded, and be subject to the series of associated problems. Plaintiff relied on implied warranties of merchantability made by Defendant concerning the Class Vehicles and sustained substantial damages resulting from the breach of those warranties by the Defendant. Plaintiff could not have Case No.

 Page 33

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

reasonably discovered the design defects of the Class Vehicles. Defendant's breach of its implied warranties of merchantability was the direct and proximate cause of Plaintiff's and the Class Members' damages.

- 117. Plaintiff and Class Members purchased the Class Vehicles within the State of California. Defendant impliedly warranted that the Class Vehicles were of merchantable quality and fit for such use. This implied warranty included, among other things: (a) a warranty that the Class Vehicles were manufactured, supplied, distributed, and/or sold by Defendant were safe for providing safe and reliable transportation; and (b) a warranty that the Class Vehicles would be fit for their intended use and would not experience flooding as a result of the water leak defect when they are driven within their range of operation and during foreseeable and normal usage.
- 118. Contrary to the applicable implied warranties, the Class Vehicles are not fit for their ordinary and intended purpose of providing Plaintiff and the Class Members durable and safe transportation during normal and/or foreseeable usage. Instead, the Class Vehicles are defective, which defects include, but are not limited to, the water leak defect.
- 119. Defendant's actions, as complained of herein, breached the implied warranty that the Class Vehicles were of merchantable quality and fit for such use in violation of California Civil Code sections 1792 and 1791.1.

RELIEF REQUESTED

- 120. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, requests the Court enter judgment against Defendant, as follows
 - An order certifying the proposed Plaintiff Class, designating a. Plaintiff as the named representative of the Class and designating the undersigned as Class Counsel;

- A declaration that Defendant is financially responsible for notifying all Class Members of the problems with its Class Vehicles and their water leak defect;
- An order requiring Defendant to comply with the Secret C. Warranty Law by (i) notifying Class Members of the secret repairing of the water leak defect, and the secret repair, replacement, and reimbursement for water leak defect related damage, as required by the California Secret Warranty Law; (ii) providing free replacement, modification, and correction related to the water leak defect to all Class Members as required by the Secret Warranty Law; (iii) identifying and reimbursing all Class Members who have paid for repairing the water leak defect, replacement of parts related to the water leak defect, and repair or replacement for damage caused as a result of the water leak defect, as required by the Secret Warranty Law; (iv) notifying California dealers of the facts underlying the water leak defect problems and the terms of GM's secret water leak defect repair program, and the repair, replacement, and reimbursement for water leak defect related damage, as required by the Secret Warranty Law; and (iv) notifying the California New Motor Vehicle Board of GM's secret water leak defect repair program, and the secret repair, replacement, and reimbursement for water leak defect related damage, as required by the Secret Warranty Law;
- d. An order enjoining Defendant from further deceptive distribution, sales, and lease practices with respect to its Class Vehicles, and to repair the water leak defect and any damage caused by the water leak defect;

Case No.

27

28

	l 1		
1		ė.	An award to Plaintiff and the Class of compensatory, statutory
2			and punitive damages, including interest, in an amount to be
3			proven at trial, except that for now, Plaintiff seeks only
4			equitable and injunctive relief with respect to his claims under
5			California's Consumer's Legal Remedies Act, California Civil
6			Code section 1750 et seq.
7		f.	An award to Plaintiff and the Class of all incidental and
8			consequential damages, including interest, which have resulted
9			from Defendant's breach of their implied warranties;
10		g.	Any and all remedies provided pursuant to the Song-Beverly
11			Act, including California Civil Code section 1794;
12		h.	A declaration that Defendant must disgorge, for the benefit of
13			the Class, all or part of the ill-gotten profits it received from
14			the sale or lease of its Class Vehicles, or to make full
15			restitution to Plaintiff and the Class Members;
16		i.	An award of attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California
17			Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the common fund
18			theory, or any other applicable statute, theory, or contract;
19		j.	An award of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as
20			provided by law;
21		k.	Leave to amend the Complaint to conform to the evidence
22			produced at trial; and
23		1.	Such other or further relief as may be appropriate under the
24			circumstances.
25			DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
26	121.	Pursu	ant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b), Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of
27	any and all	issues	in this action so triable of right.
0	1		

Page 36

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

09-50026-mg Doc 8200-1 Filed 12/21/10 Entered 12/21/10 08:14:50 Complaint Pg 38 of 45

Dated: April 12, 2010

THE LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT L. STARR

By:

Robert L. Starr Attorneys for Plaintiff

l

Case No.

09-50026-mg Doc 8200-1 Filed 12/21/10 Entered 12/21/10 08:14:50 Complaint Pg 39 of 45

EXHIBIT 1

1	Robert L. Starr (State Bar No. 183052)					
2	e-mail: starresq@hotmail.com THE LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT L. STARR					
3	23277 Ventura Boulevard					
4	Woodland Hills, California, 91364-1002 Telephone: (818) 225-9040					
5	Facsimile: (310) 225-9042					
6						
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff Rodolpho F. Mer	ndoza				
8	ነ አህነተርሙ የተፈጥርና	DISTRICT COURT				
9						
10	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIF	ORNIA—WESTERN DIVISION				
11		l				
12	RODOLPHO FIDEL MENDOZA, individually, and on behalf of a class of	Case Number:				
-13	similarly situated individuals,	DECLARATION OF ROBERT L.				
14	Plaintiff,	STARR				
15						
16	V.					
17	GENERAL MOTORS, LLC,					
18	Defendant.					
19		•				
20						
21						
22		•				
23						
24						
25		·				
26						
27						
28						

DECLARATION OF ROBERT L. STARR

I, Robert L. Starr, declare as follows:

- I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice before this Court. I am a member of the law firm the Law Office of Robert L. Starr, counsel of record for Plaintiff in this action. The following facts are within my personal knowledge, and if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto.
- 2. To the best of my knowledge, based on information and belief, Defendant General Motors, LLC is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business in Michigan. Defendant conducts business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles, and is domiciled at 818 West Seventh St., Los Angeles, California, 90017.

Executed on this 9th day of April, 2010, at Woodland Hills, California. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Bøbert L. Starr

ļ

Page I

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge A. Howard Matz and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Victor B. Kenton.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV10- 2683 AHM (VBKx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

A	All discovery related motions	sho	uld be noticed on the calendar	of th	e Magistrate Judge
=	=======================================	===		==	=======:
			NOTICE TO COUNSEL		
	py of this notice must be served w a copy of this notice must be ser		s summons and complaint on all del n all plaintiffs).	endar	nts (if a removal action is
Sub	sequent documents must be filed	at the	following location:		
[X]	Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	U	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	Ц	Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

09-50026-mg Doc 8200-1 Filed 12/21/10 Entered 12/21/10 08:14:50 Complaint Pg 43 of 45

Robert L. Starr (818) 183052), The Law Office of Robert L. Starr, 23277 Ventura Blvd., Woodland Hills, CA 91364, (818) 225-9040

	DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
Rodolfo Fidel Mendoza, individually, and on behalf o a class of similarly situated individuals,	CASE NUMBER AHM
PLAINTIFF(S)	
General Motors, LLC,	
	SUMMONS
DEFENDANT(S).	
must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached ☑ ☐ counterclaim ☐ cross-claim or a motion under Rule	ons on you (not counting the day you received it), you complaint amended complaint amended complaint the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer obert L. Starr, whose address is If you fail to do so, relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
APR 1 3 2010	CHRISTOPHER POWERS
Dated:	By:
	(Seal of the Court)

[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].

CV-01A (12/07) SUMMONS

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CAS II yes, list case number(s):	ES: Has this action been p	weviously filed in this court r	and dismissed, remanded or closed? (M/No - C) Yes				
	S: Have any coses been pr	reviously filed in this court th	init are related to the present case? No 🗆 Yes				
	Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case: Check all boxes that apply A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or class is present.						
IX. VENUE: (When comple	ting the following informs	tion, use an additional sheet	if necessary.)				
(a) List the County in this D Clack here if the govern	intrict; California County ment, its agencies or empl	outside of this District; State oyees is a named plaintiff. If	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. [this box is checked, go to item (b).				
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District: State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
Rodolfo Fidel Mendoza -	Los Angeles County						
(b) List the County in this D Check here if the govern	iatrict; Callfornia County ment, its agencies or empl	outside of this District; State oyees is a named defendant.	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant rosides. If this box is checked, go to item (e).				
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
General Motors, LLC - Lo	os Angeles County						
		outside of this District; State on of the tract of land invol	If other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.				
County in this District:			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country				
Los Angeles County							
* Los Angeles, Orange, San I Note: In land condemnation of			San Luis Obispo Counties				
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTOR			Date 4/9/10				
Notice to Counaci/Partie	s: The CV-71 (JS-44) C	ivil gover Sheet and the infor	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings e of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ting the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)				
Key to Statistical codes relating	g to Social Security Cases						
Nature of Sult (Code Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	Cause of Action				
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))					
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)					
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))					
863	D rww	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))					
864	\$\$ID	All claims for supplemental accurity income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.					

RSI

U.S.C. (g))

All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42